



AF  
JFW

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Masato Yonezawa et al.                      Art Unit : 1763  
Serial No. : 09/820,520                                      Examiner : Luz L. Alejandro  
Filed : March 28, 2001                                      Confirmation No.: 5433  
Title : PLASMA CVD DEVICE AND DISCHARGE ELECTRODE

**MAIL STOP AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY TO ACTION OF JULY 1, 2005**

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 20-34 are pending, with claims 1, 10, 22, and 30 being independent.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 26 and 27 have been rejected as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Izu (U.S. Patent No. 4,410,558). Claims 20-25 and 28-34 have been rejected as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Izu, Komino (U.S. Patent No. 6,156,151) and Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 4,808,553). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the reasons presented in the prior response and because there would have been no motivation to combine Izu with the admitted prior art, Komino and Yamazaki in the manner set forth in the rejection.

In finding motivation to combine Izu and the admitted prior art, the rejection notes that such motivation would have resulted from a desire to have the resulting structure allow for a "uniform distribution of the gas across the entire substrate" and to "maintain a uniform flow of the gas." However, neither Izu nor the admitted prior art indicates that such benefits would result from introducing gas in a parallel direction or exhausting gas from openings in the electrodes, and accordingly, the desire for such benefits cannot be used as a motivation to combine the references to produce a system including those features. (While Izu mentions a desire for uniform gas flow at col. 5, lines 17-20, Izu also states that this desire is met by including a large number of feed apertures.)

In response to applicant's prior arguments that none of the cited prior art describes or suggests introducing the gas into the chamber "in a direction parallel with said first direction so